

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 14-29, and 33-43 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 23 being the independent claims. Claims 10-13 and 30-32 have been previously canceled, and claim 5 is canceled herein without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 35-43 have been previously added. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 14, 17, 20, 23- 27, 29, 36-38, and 41-43 have been amended herein.

No new matter has been added. The amendment of these claims is supported by the Specification at least at FIGs. 13 and 16 and the accompanying text.

Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claim 1, arguing that this claim is anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0016800 A1 ("Spivak"). Claim 1 has been amended to add features that include the selection of categories of objects, the performance of multidimensional analysis thereon, and, if a concept is absent from a category of objects, indicating this to a user by explicitly referencing the concept, the category, and the absence of the concept from the category.

None of these features is disclosed or suggested by Spivak. In particular, Spivak does not disclose or suggest the selection of categories of objects, or the performance of

multidimensional analysis thereon. Rather, Spivak disclosed operation on individual documents, rather than on categories of objects. See Spivak, para. 0061. Nor does Spivak disclose or suggest the indication to a user of a concept's absence from a category of objects by explicitly referencing the concept, the category, and the absence of the concept from the category. On the contrary, Spivak discloses that a concept having a weight below a specified threshold is simply "unrecognized." Only recognized concepts are displayed. Hence Spivak does not disclose or suggest the explicit referencing of concepts that are absent and of the categories from which the concept is absent. Spivak, para. 0062, 0063.

Given that Spivak does not disclose or suggest at least the features that are listed above and added to claim 1 by amendment, Spivak does not anticipate this claim as amended. For at least this reason, claim 1 as amended is patentable over this reference.

The Examiner also argues that claims 2-9, 14-22, and 33-39 are anticipated by Spivak. Claim 5 has been canceled, rendering the rejection of this claim moot. The Examiner's arguments as to claims 2-4, 6-9, 14-22, and 33-39 are premised on the Examiner's contention that claim 1 is anticipated by Spivak. As discussed above, Spivak fails to disclose or suggest all features of claim 1 as amended. Because claims 2-4, 6-9, 14-22, and 33-39 depend from claim 1 as amended, these claims necessarily include all features of amended claim 1. Since Keith fails to disclose or suggest all features of claim 1 as amended, Spivak likewise fails to disclose or suggest all features of each of claims 2-4, 6-9, 14-22, and 33-39. For at least this reason, none of claims 2-4, 6-9, 14-22, and 33-39 is anticipated by Spivak. These claims are therefore allowable.

The Examiner has also rejected claim 23 on the same basis as the rejection of claim 1. The features of claim 23 as amended now include the selection of categories of objects, the performance of multidimensional analysis thereon, and, if a concept is absent from a category of objects, indicating this to a user by explicitly referencing the concept, the category, and the absence of the concept from the category.

As discussed above, none of these features is disclosed or suggested by Spivak. In particular, Spivak does not disclose or suggest the selection of categories of objects, or the performance of multidimensional analysis thereon. Nor does this reference disclose or suggest that if a concept is absent from a category of objects, this is indicated this to a user by explicitly referencing the concept, the category, and the absence of the concept from the category. Given that Spivak does not disclose or suggest at least the features that are listed above and added to claim 23 by amendment, Spivak does not anticipate this claim as amended. For at least this reason, claim 23 as amended is patentable over this reference.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 24-29, 34, and 40-43. The rejection of these claims is premised on the Examiner's argument that all features of claim 23 are disclosed by Spivak. As discussed above, Spivak fails to disclose all features of claim 23 as amended. Because all features of claim 23 are necessarily incorporated in claims 24-29, 34, and 40-43, Spivak fails to disclose all features of each of claims 24-29, 34, and 40-43. For at least this reason, Spivak does not anticipate these claims. Claims 24-29, 34, and 40-43 are therefore allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Sterne, Kessler, Goldstein & Fox P.L.L.C.



Edward W. Yee
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 47,294

Date: Sept. 22, 2008
1100 New York Avenue,
N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600